DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 055 548 HE 002 586

AUTHOR Pieper, W. C., Jr.
TITLE Financial Support for Institutional Research, 1969-70.
INSTITUTION Association for Institutional Research.
PUB DATE 71
NOTE 44p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Expenditures; *Financial Support; *Higher Education; *Institutional Research; *Surveys

ABSTRACT

The Association for Institutional Research conducted a survey of all institutions of higher education in the U.S. and Canada in order to assess the number, size, and financial support of institutional research offices. Data were requested for the 1969-70 academic year. This report is based on the responses of 1,444 institutions that returned the questionnaire. Of these, 1,107 or 77 percent did not have an operating institutional research (IR) office and 337 or 23 percent did. Information is presented on: (1) the number of IR offices by size, type, and control of institution; (2) offices scheduled to open during 1970-71 by type and control of institution; (3) state or other central institutional research agencies by type, control, and enrollment size; (4) financial support for IR by type, control, and enrollment size of institution; (5) sources of financial support for IR; (6) wage and salary expenditures for IR; (7) full-time equivalent staff in IR offices; and (8) other areas of expenditures such as computer time, other electronic data processing expense, publication of reports and other documents, and equipment and furniture. The questionnaire and accompanying letter are reproduced in appendix I, while appendix II gives a complete breakdown of the responses by type and control of the institution and by enrollment size. (AF)

ED0 55548

FINANCIAL SUPPORT

FOR

INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

1969 - 1970

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 005 586

FINANCIAL SUPPORT

FOR

INDSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

1969 - 1970

W. C. Pieper, Jr.

THE ASSOCIATION FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

1971

3

2

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many persons and organizations contributed to the making of this report. Addresses for the mailing of the questionnaires were provided by the National Education Association and by Dr. Robert M. Clark of the University of British Columbia. The public accounting firm of Touche, Ross and Company, particularly in the person of Miss Linda Prush, oversaw the receipt of the questionnaires, which were then edited and key punched by Miss Cherie Swanson of the Office of Institutional Research at Berkeley. In addition, assistance in reading and correcting the manuscript was generously given by Sidney Suslow and Alfred Cavanaugh, both also of the Office of Institutional Research at Berkeley.

But perhaps the most important contribution was made by the many individuals who took the time and trouble to fill out and return questionnaires. On behalf of both the Executive Committee of the Association for Institutional Research and the author, a warm word of thanks is offered.

W. C. Pieper, Jr.
Office of Institutional Research
University of California, Berkeley
June, 1971

FORWARD

Institutional Research in institutions of higher education has become widespread in large part through the desire of administrators and faculty to know more about their own institutions. Similarly, the importance and proliferation of institutional research offices has generated a need to know more about the institutional research function itself. In response to this need, the Executive Committee of the Association for Institutional Research conducted a survey of all institutions of higher education in the United States and Canada. Its purpose was to assess the number, size and financial support of institutional research offices.

Also, the reader should be aware that the Association for Institutional Research is an international individual membership organization composed of numerous individuals whose titles and institutional affiliations often do not reveal any obvious involvement with the field of institutional research. Thus, there are undoubtedly many more individuals in higher education who are interested in the activities and products of institutional research than would be apparent from the results of the study which follows.

This brief study can only be a beginning toward the goal of describing with greater accuracy the nature of the institutional research function at institutions of higher learning.

Sidney Suslow
President, 1970-1971
Association for Institutional Research

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
VALIDATION OF THE SAMPLE	2
THE NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH OFFICES	6
OFFICES SCHEDULED TO OPEN DURING 1970-71	10
STATE OR OTHER CENTRAL INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AGENCIES	12
FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH	14
SOURCES OF FINANCIAL SUPPORT	21
WAGE AND SALARY EXPENDITURES	23
FULL TIME EQUIVALENT STAFF	26
OTHER AREAS OF EXPENDITURE	28
SUMMARY	32

TEXT TABLES

1.	A.I.R. Sample Compared to A.C.E. Census of U.S. Institutions.	4
2.	Percent of the Sample Group which Reported Having an Institutional Research Office by Type and Control of Institution and Enrollment Size	5
3.	The Effect of Normalizing Type and Control of Institution for Enrollment Size on the Propensity to Have an Institutional Research Office	7
4.	Institutions Planning to Initiate IR Offices During 1970-71 by Type, Control, and Enrollment Size	11
5.	Institutions Served by State or Other Central Institutional Research Agencies by Type, Control, and Enrollment Size	13
6.	Total Support for Institutional Research by Type of Control and Enrollment Size	15
7.	Total Support for Institutional Reseesrch at Universities by Type of Control and Enrollment Size	16
8.	Total Support for Institutional Research at Four-Year Colleges by Type of Control and Enrollment Size	17

TEXT TABLES (continued) Page

9. Total Support for Institutional Research at Two-Year Colleges by Type of Control and Enrollment Size 18

10. The Average Percent of Their Total Operating Budgets that Institutions in the Sample Group Devoted to Institutional Research Activity 20

11. Percent of Total Support for Institutional Research Activity Derived from Regularly Budgeted Institutional Funds 21

12. Percent of Total Support for Institutional Research Activity Derived from Grants and/or Contracts with Outside Agencies . . . 23

13. Percent of Total Expenditure for Institutional Research Devoted to Wages and Salaries 24

14. Percent of Total Expenditure for Institutional Research Devoted to Salaries of Director and Professional Research Staff 25

15. Average Percent of Total Expenditure for Institutional Research Devoted to Wages and Salaries by Type of Institution and Type of Employee 26

16. Average Number of Full Time Equivalent Institutional Research Staff by Type of Institution and Type of Employee 27

17. Average Percent of Total Expenditure for Institutional Research Devoted to Non-Salary Items by Type of Institution and Type of Expense 29

APPENDIX

I. THE QUESTIONNAIRE 33

II. INSTITUTIONS WHICH RESPONDED TO THE SURVEY BY TYPE, CONTROL AND ENROLLMENT SIZE 37

INTRODUCTION

Presented herein are the results of a survey undertaken by the Executive Committee of the Association for Institutional Research and carried out by the Office of Institutional Research at the University of California, Berkeley. During the fall term of 1970, some 3,000 questionnaires were sent to the presidents of all two and four-year colleges and all universities in the United States and Canada. The questionnaire and accompanying letter are reproduced in full as Appendix I of this report. Respondents were assured of complete anonymity with regard to their replies, which was achieved by having all returns channeled through the San Francisco office of Touche, Ross and Company, Certified Public Accountants. There postmarks and other possible identification were removed prior to the questionnaires' being forwarded to Berkeley for processing. The total number of questionnaires returned was just under 50% of those sent. There was no attempt to obtain additional responses through the use of follow-up correspondence.

The questionnaire addressed itself initially to obtaining a basic profile of each institution and then, if the institution did in fact have an office whose primary responsibility was institutional research, went on to ask about sources and amounts of support for this activity, amounts expended in various categories of expense, number of FTE staff members and the percent of the institution's operating budget which the total institutional research expenditure represented. All data requested were for the 1969-1970 academic year, which would have been the most recent complete year at the time the questionnaire went out.

VALIDATION OF THE SAMPLE

The sample group on which this report is based consists of the 1,444 institutions who completed and returned questionnaires. Of these, 1,107 (77%) did not have an operating IR office and 337 (23%) did. While there are considerably more data on the latter group than the former, nearly all respondents were conscientious in supplying the information requested in Section 1, "Institutional Profile".

Appendix II gives a complete breakdown of the responses by type and control of institution and by enrollment size. Institutions representing all combinations of these factors are included, and in general, the sample population conforms quite well to the distribution of institutions reported in the American Council on Education Fact Book for 1970. This is an imperfect comparison in that the ACE data do not include Canadian institutions, but it was not possible either to remove Canadian institutions from the sample or to obtain comparable data on Canadian institutions which could be added to the ACE figures. There is, however, reason to think that the ACE data describe the universe of educational institutions adequately enough in terms of type. control, and enrollment size to make some comparison worthwhile.(*) Presented in Table 1 are figures which illustrate the similarities and differences between the sample group and this larger population.

(*) A publication entitled Advanced Statistics of Education (Ottawa: Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1970) reports a comprehensive count of 117 colleges and universities operating in Canada as of 1969-70. Thus, unless the distribution of Canadian institutions in terms of type, control, and enrollment size differs radically from the distribution of U.S. institutions, inclusion of Canadian data based on these 117 institutions would not materially effect the overall distribution because of the vastly greater number (2,551) of U.S. institutions for which data are shown.

The sample over-represents by 10% the proportion of public institutions, and it also over-represents the proportion of universities compared to four-year colleges. However, the proportion of two-year colleges is accurately reflected, and more importantly, there is an extremely close correspondence between the sample and the overall population with regard to enrollment size. This last fact very likely offsets any bias in the findings that might be introduced through the oversampling of public institutions and universities, because the analysis clearly shows that enrollment size is the most important institutional characteristic associated with either the existence of or support for an IR office. In any case, the variation between the sample and the population is well within the range that can be expected given the process of self-selection by which respondents are determined in mail surveys of this kind.

TABLE 1

A.I.R. Sample Compared to A.C.E. Census (*)
of U.S. Institutions

Percent Distributions by Control, Type,
and Enrollment Size

Control	Public	Private	All Inst.
A.C.E. Fact Book	42%	58%	100%
A.I.R. Sample	52%	48%	100%

Type of Institution	Univ.	Four Yr. Coll.	Two Yr. Coll.	All Inst.
A.C.E. Fact Book	12%	53%	35%	100%
A.I.R. Sample	18%	41%	37%	100%

Enrollment Size	Less Than 1,000	1,000-4,999	5,000-9,999	10,000 & Above	All Inst.
A.C.E. Fact Book	48%	36%	9%	7%	100%
A.I.R. Sample	49%	35%	9%	7%	100%

(*) Source for A.C.E. figures was A Fact Book on Higher Education (Issue No. 3, 1970) published by the American Council on Education, Washington, D.C. The percent distributions represent institutions open and operating as of fall term 1969. The total number of such institutions reported was 2,551.

TABLE 2

Percent of the Sample Group which Reported Having An Institutional Research Office by Type and Control of Institution and Enrollment Size(*)

Type & Control of Institution	Full Time Enrollment						All Institutions
	Less Than 1,000	1,000-4,999	5,000-9,999	10,000-19,999	20,000-29,999	30,000- & Above	
Universities							
Publicly Controlled	0	47	65	77	100	86	61
Privately Controlled	8	28	40	73	--	--	34
All Universities	4	37	57	75	100	86	51
Four-Year Colleges							
Publicly Controlled	27	35	70	100	--	--	42
Privately Controlled	10	22	--	--	--	--	14
All Four-Year Colleges	10	27	70	100	--	--	19
Two-Year Colleges							
Publicly Controlled	4	27	53	80	100	--	34
Privately Controlled	2	30	--	--	--	--	5
All Two-Year Colleges	4	28	53	80	100	--	16
Total Sample Group							
Publicly Controlled	6	32	63	79	100	86	31
Privately Controlled	8	24	40	73	--	--	15
All Institutions	7	28	59	76	100	86	23

(*) The numerical totals against which these percents were calculated are reported in detail in Appendix II.

THE NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH OFFICES

As Table 2 shows, 23% of the institutions which returned questionnaires reported having offices or units whose primary responsibility is in the area of institutional research. Table 2 also seems to indicate that this proportion varies widely with control, type of institution, and enrollment size. For example, public institutions are twice as likely to have IR offices as private institutions, and universities are more than twice as likely to have IR offices than either four or two-year colleges. However, further analysis reveals that these differences are very largely a function of enrollment size with type of institution and control of institution playing only a small part.

This is clearly shown in Table 3. Enrollment size was factored out of the data by normalizing each of the sub-groups to the enrollment distribution of the overall sample. This allows true comparison on the basis of either control or type alone. The column entitled "Adjusted Score" shows that the entire difference between the proportion of universities reporting IR offices compared to the proportion of four-year colleges reporting IR offices can be attributed solely to the larger average enrollment size of universities and not to any factor associated with type of institution per se. Even two-year colleges fall only marginally below the population mean when viewed in terms of the adjusted score. Similarly, the difference between public and private institutions is reduced substantially with the influence of enrollment size removed. Instead of a public institution figure of 31% and a private institution figure of 15% (a net difference of 16 percentage points), the adjusted scores are 25 and 19, respectively. This difference is still significant, of course, but is actually less than one might expect. Initially, IR offices existed primarily at public

TABLE 3

The Effect of Normalizing Type and Control of Institution for Enrollment Size on the Propensity to Have an Institutional Research Office

Type & Control of Institution	No. of Institutions In Sample	No. Reporting IR Office	% of Total Reporting IR Office	Adjusted Score(*)
Universities	258	131	51%	25
Four-Year Colleges	595	115	19%	25
Two-Year Colleges	541	89	16%	21
Total Sample	1444	337	23%	23
Public Institutions	744	233	31%	25
Private Institutions	691	101	15%	19
Total Sample	1444	337	23%	23

(*) Enrollment size was factored out by normalizing the subpopulations to the enrollment distribution of the overall sample. Any enrollment size distribution could have been used, but using the overall distribution yields a total adjusted score which does not differ from the raw percent figure for the total sample.

institutions, having grown out of the need to supply budgetary and planning data to state governments. Thus, to find private institutions only 6 points below public institutions (with the effect of enrollment size removed) in the proportion reporting IR offices indicates that this historic disparity is apparently decreasing through time.

Returning to the subject of enrollment size, the reader can best assess the importance of this factor as an indicator of an institution's propensity to have an IR office by looking at the row labelled "All Institutions" in Table 2. Among institutions with fewer than 1,000 full time enrollments, only 7% had IR offices, but each increment in size yields a higher percent figure until virtually 100% of those institutions with enrollments of 20,000 and above reported having such a unit. Moreover, the range of percents by enrollment category is almost equally broad and equally regular for each

type of institution and each mode of control. The only irregularity is the surprisingly high figure of 27% reported by publicly controlled four-year colleges with enrollments of less than 1,000. The sample size here is small (only 15 institutions out of 1,444 fall into this category), and this may in itself have produced a distorted result. Another possible explanation is that the four small colleges who reported having IR offices are new institutions whose organizational structure was established in anticipation of future growth.

In any case, IR clearly seems to have found a permanent place for itself as a recognized organizational specialty. Francis Rourke and Glenn Brooks in their book The Managerial Revolution in Higher Education (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1966) report a number of findings concerning the growth of IR and the various ways in which such offices operate. Unfortunately little of their data is directly comparable to the results of the current survey, primarily because of a marked difference in sampling technique.

The Rourke and Brooks survey was restricted to four-year institutions in the United States, and the population consisted of all state institutions but only a small sample (N=72) of community colleges and private institutions. Moreover, in asking about the IR function, their questionnaire was phrased such that institutions which had an individual staff member performing IR work but no formal IR office could not be differentiated from institutions which did have formal IR offices. The effect of each of these factors is to oppose the other: the restricted universe from which the sample derives almost certainly excluded a number of institutions with IR offices, but the confusion of individuals with offices overstates the apparent number of offices found among the institutions sampled. A measure of the effect of this latter factor is the significantly higher percent of (four-year)

institutions reporting IR offices in the Rourke and Brooks data than in the A.I.R. data, 45% compared to 29%. Also, unless one assumes that all institutions with IR offices which were included in either the Rourke and Brooks universe or the A.I.R. universe actually returned their questionnaires, the fact that the earlier survey enjoyed an 80% response compared to a 50% response for the current effort would act to increase the count of IR offices reported in the earlier year.

It is, of course, possible that these three factors simply cancel one another, in which case the data from the two surveys are sufficiently comparable to give the reader a rough idea of the rate at which IR offices have been established in recent years. In this hope, and with due respect for the preceding caveats, a few comparisons with the Rourke and Brooks data are offered.

Their earliest figure, for the academic year 1954-55, showed only 15 IR offices nationally, with a full one-third of those having been established just that year. By 1964-65 this figure had grown to 115, 21 of them newly established. These figures compare to an estimated count of 220(*) offices reported at four-year institutions in the current survey. No count of newly established offices exists for 1969-70, however, because the A.I.R. questionnaire did not request information on this point. But the data do show a sustained growth in the number of IR offices at a rate equivalent to 20% per year over the period 1955 to 1969, although the rate during the 1964 to 1969 period has slowed to approximately 15% per year.

An additional finding reported by Rourke and Brooks, and one that

---

(*)This figure represents the total of 337 offices reported less the 89 offices at two-year colleges and less an estimated 28 offices at four-year institutions in Canada.

corroborates the results of the present survey, is the importance of enrollment size in stimulating the development of IR offices. Their data showed that 72% of institutions with more than 10,000 students have such offices compared to 20% of institutions with fewer than 2,000 students enrolled. These percent figures are not directly comparable to the A.I.R. data because of differences in grouping, but they do serve to illustrate the principle involved.

OFFICES SCHEDULED TO OPEN DURING 1970-71

Although, as mentioned above, the questionnaire did not address itself to the matter of newly established IR offices or to plans for the establishment of such offices, 27 institutions from the large group who had no office during 1969-70 indicated that they were actively planning to initiate IR offices during 1970-71. Since these responses were volunteered in the form of written comments, they probably account for only a portion of the actual number of offices which were scheduled to begin operation during the current year, but this number still represents an 8% increase in the total number of offices reported for 1969-70. This would indicate that IR continues to be in an active growth phase, although there is reason to think that the rate of growth may have dropped somewhat from the recent 15% per annum cited above. With most segments of higher education facing difficult budgetary situations in recent years, funds to establish new offices and units are not readily available. Thus, many institutions, especially the smaller private institutions which have limited resources even in the best of times, have been forced to defer any formal move into IR activity until the future. Nonetheless, these institutions represent the natural field for the growth of IR as a profession, both because nearly all larger institutions already

have IR offices and also because IR offices have proven their utility at institutions where they have been established.

TABLE 4

Institutions Planning to Initiate IR Offices
During 1970-71 by Type, Control, and Enrollment Size(*)

Type and Control of Institution	Full Time Enrollment			
	Less Than 1,000	1,000-4,999	5,000-9,999	Total
Universities				
Publicly Controlled	--	2	2	4
Privately Controlled	--	2	2	4
Total	--	4	4	8
Four-Year Colleges				
Publicly Controlled	2	1	1	4
Privately Controlled	3	4	--	7
Total	5	5	1	11
Two-Year Colleges				
Publicly Controlled	1	5	1	7
Privately Controlled	--	1	--	1
Total	1	6	1	8
All Types				
Publicly Controlled	3	8	4	15
Privately Controlled	3	7	2	12
Total	6	15	6	27

(*)Counts reported in this table represent tallies of certain comments voluntarily supplied by respondents to amplify their responses to questionnaire item 2.

For example, it is interesting to note that over 75% of the institutions which were planning to establish IR offices had enrollments of less than 5,000 students, and that there were nearly equal numbers of public and private institutions. Also, there was a balanced representation of universities,

four-year colleges, and two-year colleges. See Table 4 for a complete breakdown of these 27 institutions by type, control, and enrollment size.

STATE OR OTHER CENTRAL INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AGENCIES

Also of particular interest are the responses of those institutions which do not have IR offices of their own but are served by a state or other central IR agency. As Table 5 shows, there were 97 such institutions, over 60% of which were two-year colleges and 85% of which were publicly controlled.

There are no comparative data on which to draw, so it is not possible to assess the growth, if any, in the number of institutions served by central IR agencies. But for many small institutions this may be a solution to the problem of need for IR services but lack of funds to initiate a separate office. As institutions grow, however, they apparently tend to undertake their own IR work. Only 1 of the 97 institutions served by central agencies had an enrollment greater than 10,000 students.

But these institutions are a significant element in the overall growth of IR. They represent in number a group 25% as large as the total number of institutions reporting IR offices, and comprise 7% of the total number of questionnaires returned. If this latter figure is added to the 23% who reported having IR offices and the 2% who indicated that they were in the process of initiating such offices, nearly one-third (32%) of all institutions in the United States and Canada now use an IR office to assist in the evaluation of their educational and administrative programs.

TABLE 5

Institutions Served by State or Other Central Institutional Research Agencies by Type, Control, and Enrollment Size

Type and Control of Institution	Full Time Enrollment				
	Less Than 1,000	1,000-4,999	5,000-9,999	10,000-19,999	Total
Universities					
Publicly Controlled	6	3	4	1	14
Privately Controlled	--	--	--	--	--
Total	6	3	4	1	14
Four-Year Colleges					
Publicly Controlled	3	6	1	---	10
Privately Controlled	6	5	--	--	11
Total	9	11	1	--	21
Two-Year Colleges					
Publicly Controlled	45	11	--	--	57
Privately Controlled	2	1	--	--	3
Total	47	12	--	--	60
All Types					
Publicly Controlled	55	21	5	1	83
Privately Controlled	8	6	--	--	14
Total	63	27	5	1	97(*)

(*)Totals include one institution which did not indicate enrollment size and two which did not indicate type. Mode of control was shown in all cases.

FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

In preparing the data on financial support, it was assumed that most readers would be associated in some way with an institution of higher education and that they would want to be able to identify the responses of institutions similar to their own in terms of type, control, and enrollment size. For this reason, all tables dealing with aggregate support figures were organized in terms of these three variables, even though this led to very small or even zero entries in many cells. Also, the reader should keep in mind that this and all subsequent sections of the report are based on the responses of only those institutions which reported having an IR office (N=337).

Table 6 shows total support for IR activity summarized by mode of control and enrollment size. Tables 7, 8, and 9 show analogous figures for universities, four-year colleges, and two-year colleges, respectively. As can be seen from the average support figures, enrollment size is once again the critical factor, although mode of control is quite important as well. Public institutions spend significantly more money on IR than do private institutions, and this is particularly true among four-year colleges. Interestingly, however, private universities, while less likely to have IR offices than public universities, support them somewhat better where they do exist.

The tables themselves are detailed and explicit, and they render unnecessary an extended treatment of the findings on financial support here in the text. But one characteristic of these financial support data definitely bears mention. Within enrollment size catagories, there is considerable dispersion of responses around the mean, and this is true for each of the subpopulations represented in Tables 7 through 9. Thus,

TABLE 6

Total Support for Institutional Research
by Type of Control and Enrollment Size

Total Support for Institutional Research	Less Than 1,000	1,000-4,999	5,000-9,999	10,000-19,999	20,000-29,999	30,000-And Above	Enroll. Not Indicated	Total
	Publicly Controlled (2) — Full Time Enrollment							
$1,000 - $ 9,999	2	10	3	--	1	--	1	17
$10,000 - $19,999	3	13	8	3	--	--	--	27
$20,000 - $29,999	5	34	19	5	1	--	1	65
$30,000 - $39,999	3	10	11	10	--	--	1	35
$40,000 - $59,999	--	4	13	8	1	--	--	26
$60,000 - $99,999	1	5	4	8	3	1	1	23
$100,000 and Above	--	2	4	1	3	5	1	16
No Amount Shown	1	15	6	2	--	--	--	24
Total	15	93	68	37	9	6	5	233
Average Support(1)	$28,550	$31,800	$42,200	$47,900	$90,900	$169,550	$117,950	$45,950
	Privately Controlled							
$ 1,000 - $ 9,999	11	8	--	--	--	--	--	19
$10,000 - $19,999	13	10	2	3	--	--	--	28
$20,000 - $29,999	3	11	2	1	--	--	--	17
$30,000 - $39,999	--	1	2	--	--	--	--	3
$40,000 - $59,999	1	7	3	--	--	--	1	12
$60,000 - $99,999	--	1	1	3	--	--	--	5
$100,000 and Above	--	2	--	1	--	--	--	3
No Amount Shown	5	9	--	--	--	--	--	14
Total	33	49	10	8	--	--	1	101
Average Support(1)	$12,900	$40,950	$39,100	$54,800	--	--	$ 49,000	$33,100
	All Institutions(3)							
$ 1,000 - $ 9,999	13	19	3	--	1	--	1	37
$10,000 - $19,999	16	23	10	6	--	--	--	55
$20,000 - $29,999	8	45	21	6	1	--	1	82
$30,000 - $39,999	3	11	13	10	--	--	1	38
$40,000 - $59,999	1	11	16	8	1	--	1	38
$60,000 - $99,999	1	6	6	11	3	1	1	29
$100,000 and Above	--	4	4	2	3	5	1	19
No Amount Shown	6	25	6	2	--	--	--	39
Total	48	144	79	45	9	6	6	337
Average Support(1)	$18,100	$34,700	$42,250	$49,200	$90,900	$169,550	$106,450	$42,150

(1) Based on the number of actual responses to this item (i.e. the total less the number of non-responses).

(2) Figures include two institutions which were publicly controlled but which did not appear in Tables 7, 8, or 9 because no type of institution was shown.

(3) Figures include three institutions (1 university, 1 four-year college, and 1 two-year college) which did not indicate whether they were publicly or privately controlled.

TABLE 7

Total Support for Institutional Research at
Universities by Type of Control and Enrollment Size

Total Support for Institutional Research	Less Than 1,000	1,000-4,999	5,000-9,999	10,000-19,999	20,000-29,999	30,000-And Above	Enroll. Not Indicated	Total
	Publicly Controlled							
	Full Time Enrollment							
$ 1,000 - $ 9,999	--	1	2	--	1	--	--	4
$10,000 - $19,999	--	4	5	3	--	--	--	12
$20,000 - $29,999	--	4	10	3	--	--	--	17
$30,000 - $39,999	--	2	5	6	--	--	--	13
$40,000 - $59,999	--	3	6	8	1	--	--	18
$60,000 - $99,999	--	--	3	8	3	1	1	16
$100,000 and Above	--	--	1	1	3	5	1	11
No Amount Shown	--	4	2	1	--	--	--	7
Total	--	18	34	30	8	6	2	98
Average Support(1)		$28,150	$35,550	$50,900	$98,900	$169,500	$263,800	$58,750
	Privately Controlled							
$ 1,000 - $ 9,999	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
$10,000 - $19,999	1	3	2	3	--	--	--	9
$20,000 - $29,999	--	3	2	1	--	--	--	6
$30,000 - $39,999	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	2
$40,000 - $59,999	--	3	3	--	--	--	1	7
$60,000 - $99,999	--	1	1	3	--	--	--	5
$100,000 and Above	--	2	--	1	--	--	--	3
No Amount Shown	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Total	1	12	10	8	--	--	1	32
Average Support(1)	$12,000	$88,050	$39,100	$54,750	--	--	$ 49,000	$60,550
	All Universities(2)							
$ 1,000 - $ 9,999	--	1	2	--	1	--	--	4
$10,000 - $19,999	1	7	7	6	--	--	--	21
$20,000 - $29,999	--	7	12	4	--	--	--	23
$30,000 - $39,999	--	2	7	6	--	--	--	15
$40,000 - $59,999	--	6	9	8	1	--	1	25
$60,000 - $99,999	--	1	5	11	3	1	1	22
$100,000 and Above	--	2	1	2	3	5	1	14
No Amount Shown	--	4	2	1	--	--	--	7
Total	1	30	45	38	8	6	3	131
Average Support(1)	$12,000	$55,800	$36,400	$51,750	$98,900	$169,550	$192,200	$59,250

(1) Based on the number of actual responses to this item (i.e. the total less the number of non-responses).

(2) Figures include one college which did not indicate whether it was publicly or privately controlled.

TABLE 8

Total Support for Institutional Research at
Four-Year Colleges by Type of Control and Enrollment Size

Total Support for Institutional Research	Less Than 1,000	1,000-4,999	5,000-9,999	10,000-19,999	20,000-29,999	30,000-And Above	Enroll. Not Indicated	Total
	Publicly Controlled — Full Time Enrollment							
$ 1,000 - $ 9,999	--	3	1	--	--	--	--	4
$10,000 - $19,999	--	4	1	--	--	--	--	5
$20,000-- $29,999	2	7	7	1	--	--	--	17
$30,000 - $39,999	1	3	2	2	--	--	--	8
$40,000 - $59,999	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	2
$60,000 - $99,999	--	4	--	--	--	--	--	4
$100,000 and Above	--	2	2	--	--	--	--	4
No Amount Shown	1	4	1	--	--	--	--	6
Total	4	27	16	3	--	--	--	50
Average Support(1)	$31,750	$49,300	$47,300	$33,350	--	--	--	$47,000
	Privately Controlled							
$ 1,000 - $ 9,999	10	7	--	--	--	--	--	17
$10,000 - $19,999	12	6	--	--	--	--	--	18
$20,000 - $29,999	3	8	--	--	--	--	--	11
$30,000 - $39,999	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	1
$40,000 - $59,999	1	3	--	--	--	--	--	4
$60,000 - $99,999	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
$100,000 and Above	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
No Amount Shown	4	9	--	--	--	--	--	13
Total	30	34	--	--	--	--	--	64
Average Support(1)	$13,250	$20,700	--	--	--	--	--	$16,900
	All Four-Year Colleges(2)							
$ 1,000 - $ 9,999	10	11	1	--	--	--	--	22
$10,000 - $19,999	12	10	1	--	--	--	--	23
$20,000 - $29,999	5	15	7	1	--	--	--	28
$30,000 - $39,999	1	4	2	2	--	--	--	9
$40,000 - $59,999	1	3	2	--	--	--	--	6
$60,000 - $99,999	--	4	--	--	--	--	--	4
$100,000 and Above	--	2	2	--	--	--	--	4
No Amount Shown	5	13	1	--	--	--	--	19
Total	34	62	16	3	--	--	--	115
Average Support(1)	$15,150	$34,400	$49,300	$33,350	--	--	--	$30,850

(1) Based on the number of actual responses to this item (i.e. the total less the number of non-responses).

(2) Figures include one university which did not indicate whether it was publicly or privately controlled.

TABLE 9

Total Support for Institutional Research at
Two-Year Colleges by Type of Control and Enrollment Size

Total Support for Institutional Research	Full Time Enrollment							
	Less Than 1,000	1,000-4,999	5,000-9,999	10,000-19,999	20,000-29,999	30,000 And Above	Enroll. Not Indicated	Total
Publicly Controlled								
$ 1,000 - $ 9,999	2	6	--	--	--	--	1	9
$10,000 - $19,999	3	5	2	--	--	--	--	10
$20,000 - $29,999	2	23	2	1	1	--	1	30
$30,000 - $39,999	2	5	4	2	--	--	1	14
$40,000 - $59,999	--	1	4	--	--	--	--	5
$60,000 - $99,999	1	1	1	--	--	--	--	3
$100,000 and Above	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	1
No Amount Shown	--	7	3	1	--	--	--	11
Total	10	48	17	4	1	--	3	83
Average Support(1)	$27,950	$23,250	$49,200	$33,750	$27,000	--	$20,750	$29,350
Privately Controlled								
$ 1,000 - $ 9,999	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	2
$10,000 - $19,999	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	1
$20,000 - $29,999	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
$30,000 - $39,999	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
$40,000 - $59,999	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	1
$60,000 - $99,999	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
$100,000 and Above	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
No Amount Shown	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
Total	2	3	--	--	--	--	--	5
Average Support(1)	$ 5,300	$21,150	--	--	--	--	--	$13,760
All Two-Year Colleges(2)								
$ 1,000 - $ 9,999	3	7	--	--	--	--	1	11
$10,000 - $19,999	3	6	2	--	--	--	--	11
$20,000 - $29,999	2	23	2	1	1	--	1	30
$30,000 - $39,999	2	5	4	2	--	--	1	14
$40,000 - $59,999	--	2	4	--	--	--	--	6
$60,000 - $99,999	1	1	1	--	--	--	--	1
$100,000 and Above	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	1
No Amount Shown	1	8	3	1	--	--	--	13
Total	12	52	17	4	1	--	3	89
Average Support(1)	$25,900	$23,100	$49,200	$33,750	$27,000	--	$20,750	$28,700

(1) Based on the number of actual responses to this item (i.e. the total less the number of non-responses).

(2) Figures include one two-year college which did not indicate whether it was publicly or privately controlled.

there exists no clear norm upon which the reader can focus. Except in the very largest and very smallest enrollment categories, there are a significant number of responses at each of the levels of total support. This is partially true because the classification intervals used in these tables are broader at the higher levels of support, which artificially increases the number of responses in those cells compared to cells with smaller intervals. Nonetheless, it is also true that IR offices are funded at levels which vary widely from institution to institution, and these variations are not explained by differences in type, mode of control, or enrollment size.

For example, there are institutions with enrollments of 5,000 to 9,999 students which allocate as little as $.65 per student to IR while other institutions of equal size allocate in excess of $12.00 per student for the same purpose. Obviously, these differences merely reflect more important differences in the overall availability of funds to the institution, the role of the IR office, and the ability of the IR director to compete for an increased share of the funds that are available. In any case, the average support figures should be used with caution. It is interesting to note that the average support for IR activity during 1969-70 was $42,150 and that universities were 40% above the mean while two and four-year colleges were 30% below. However, this kind of analysis invites one to overlook the fact that many two-year colleges fund their IR offices more generously than do universities or four-year colleges of the same enrollment size.

Table 10 is an interesting supplement to the above discussion. It shows the amount of support for IR at institutions of various types and sizes expressed as a percent of the total operating budget for the institution. The figures are, of course, very small, with the average being less than

TABLE 10

The Average Percent of their Total Operating Budgets that Institutions in the Sample Group Devoted to Institutional Research Activity(*)

Full Time Enrollment	Type of Institution				
	Univer-sities	Four-Year Colleges	Two-Year Colleges	Other & No Response	Overall Average
Less Than 1,000	0.01%	0.53%	0.86%	0.28%	0.62%
1,000 - 4,999	0.42%	0.37%	0.89%	--	0.56%
5,000 - 9,999	0.18%	0.24%	0.85%	0.50%	0.32%
10,000 - 19,999	0.12%	0.06%	0.47%	--	0.15%
20,000 - 29,999	0.08%	--	--	--	0.08%
30,000 and Above	0.31%	--	--	--	0.31%
No Enrollment Shown	0.01%	--	0.33%	--	0.22%
Overall Average	0.21%	0.37%	0.83%	0.39%	0.42%
No. of Responses	101	72	59	2	234
No. of Non-Responses	30	43	30	--	103
Total	131	115	89	2	337

(*) All percents are based on the number of actual responses to this item (i.e. the total for each cell less the number of incomplete or non-responses).

one-half of one percent (0.42%). But of particular note is that the percent figures vary with type of institution and enrollment size in a way which is inverse to the actual dollar support for IR as reported in Tables 6-9.

Thus, two-year colleges, who as a group had the lowest average level of support for IR, devoted by far the largest share of their overall budgets to this purpose compared to other types of institutions. That is, two-year colleges spent 0.83% of their budgets on IR compared to 0.37% for four-year colleges and 0.21% for universities. Similarly, the larger the enrollment size of an institution the smaller the share of its resources it tended to devote to IR. So, not only is it remarkable to find two-year colleges willing to spend more on IR than some universities, it is doubly remarkable in that they must make a relatively greater financial commitment

in order to have such an office at all. What seems to be taking place is that there is a certain minimum efficacious size for an IR office and to fund even this basic unit requires more of the resources of a small college or university than of a large one.

SOURCES OF FINANCIAL SUPPORT

Tables 11 and 12 show quite clearly that two sources of funds account for nearly all financial support for IR in the United States and Canada. Moreover, one of these, regularly budgeted institutional funds, itself

TABLE 11

Percent of Total Support for Institutional Research Activity Derived from Regularly Budgeted Institutional Funds

Percent of Total Support for IR(1)	Type of Institution				
	Universities	Four-Year Colleges	Two-Year Colleges	Other & No Response	Total
1 % - 45%	4	11	4	--	19
46% - 55%	2	4	4	--	10
56% - 65%	3	2	2	--	7
66% - 75%	3	1	2	--	6
76% - 85%	10	3	3	--	16
86% - 95%	12	5	2	--	19
96% - **100%**	87	68	54	2	211
No Response	10	21	18	--	49
Total	131	115	89	2	337
Average Percent(2)	93%	86%	90%	100%	90%

(1) Percent figures in Tables 11, 12, 13, and 14 were grouped such that they may be easily compared from table to table. The group intervals are either identical, or where one table is more detailed than another, aggregation of the detail will produce figures directly comparable to those shown elsewhere at higher levels of summarization. Bold type entries in the row headings indicate the upper and lower bounds of comparable groupings.

(2) Based on the number of actual responses to this item (i.e. the total less the number of non-responses).

accounted for an average of 90% of all IR support. By type of institution (which is used here as a rough expression of enrollment size as well as to describe the scope of the academic program), there was almost no variation from the sample mean. The range was only 7 percentage points, with university IR offices deriving the high of 93% of their support from regularly budgeted institutional funds and offices at four-year colleges deriving the low of 86%. Moreover, the overall distribution was tightly clustered around the mean. Some 88% of the offices received at least three fourths of their support from this one source (see Table 11).

The second major source of financial support for IR was through grants and contracts with governmental or other outside agencies (see Table 12). Fewer than 20% of the institutions in the sample had outside support, but this source of funding was definitely of greater importance to two and four-year colleges than to universities. More of the former institutions had outside funding (20% compared to 12%), and this funding represented a larger average share of their budgets (9% compared to 3%). In fact, if an IR office had outside support, it tended to be a significant factor in the total funding. The average percent contributed by outside agencies to offices that received at least some outside support was over 40%.

Overall, however, the average IR office received 7% of its support from outside sources and 90% from regularly budgeted institutional sources. This left 3% to come from supplementary budget allocations, recharge income, and miscellaneous sources. Of these, the least important but perhaps most interesting was recharge income. Only 10 offices had income from recharges for services rendered, although one university listed this as having provided 100% of its IR support.

TABLE 12

Percent of Total Support for Institutional Research Activity Derived from Grants and/or Contracts with Outside Agencies

Percent of Total Support for IR(1)	Type of Institution				
	Universities	Four-Year Colleges	Two-Year Colleges	Other & No Response	Total
1 % - 5 %	5	3	2	--	10
6 % - 15%	2	3	1	--	6
16% - 25%	2	1	4	--	7
26% - 35%	1	1	--	--	2
36% - 45%	2	4	1	--	7
46% - 55%	--	4	3	--	7
56% - 100%	3	8	6	--	17
No Response	116	91	72	2	281
Total	131	115	89	2	337
Average Percent(2)	3%	10%	9%	--	7%

(1) Percent figures in Tables 11, 12, 13, and 14 were grouped such that they may be easily compared from table to table. The group intervals are either identical, or where one table is more detailed than another, aggregation of the detail will produce figures directly comparable to those shown elsewhere at higher levels of summarization. Bold type entries in the row headings indicate the upper and lower bounds of comparable groupings.

(2) In this calculation, non-responses were treated as zero entries so that these percents would be additive to those shown in Table 11.

WAGE AND SALARY EXPENDITURES

It is normal, particularly in adminstrative and research work, for wage and salary payments to be the largest single category of expense. As Table 13 shows, IR offices not only conform to this rule, but on the average devote over 70% of their available resources to paying their employees. And, as with much of the expenditure data, there were only minor variations from this mean percent among the three types of institutions. Over 95% of all institutions in the sample spent more than 55% of their resources on wages and salaries, and a full 25% of the respondents spent 96% or more of their funds for this purpose.

TABLE 13

Percent of Total Expenditure for Institutional Research
Devoted to Wages and Salaries

Percent of Total IR Expenditure(*)	Type of Institution				
	Univer-sities	Four-Year Colleges	Two-Year Colleges	Other & No Response	Total
1 % - 45%	1	2	1	--	4
46% - 55%	2	1	1	--	4
56% - 65%	6	5	5	--	16
66% - 75%	11	3	3	--	17
76% - 85%	26	14	11	--	51
86% - 95%	51	29	16	2	98
96% - 100%	20	32	32	--	84
No Response	14	29	20	--	63
Total	131	115	89	2	337
Average Percent	76%	67%	68%	88%	71%

(*) Percent figures in Tables 11, 12, 13, and 14 were grouped such that they may be easily compared from table to table. The group intervals are either identical, or where one table is more detailed than another, aggregation of the detail will produce figures directly comparable to those shown elsewhere at higher levels of summarization. Bold type entries in the row headings indicate the upper and lower bounds of comparable groupings.

Tables 14 and 15 break the wage and salary figures into component parts. As can be seen, well over half the salary money is spent on so-called professional salaries, which include research personnel as well as the director of the office or unit. Of course for many small offices, the director himself comprises the entire research staff in addition to administering the operation of the unit. Table 14 deals exclusively with the responses concerning professional salaries. Here again the data show relatively little dispersion around the mean and great consistency among the types of institutions.

Table 15 is a summary table, which incorporates the average percents from Table 14, and shows these as a line item along with average percents

TABLE 14

Percent of Total Expenditure for Institutional Research
Devoted to Salaries of Director and Professional Research Staff

Percent of Total IR Expenditure(*)	Type of Institution				
	Univer-sities	Four-Year Colleges	Two-Year Colleges	Other & No Response	Total
1 % - 15%	1	1	--	--	2
16% - 25%	4	2	2	--	8
26% - 35%	5	4	2	--	11
36% - 45%	6	2	2	--	10
46% - 55%	27	10	8	--	45
56% - 65%	28	11	11	1	51
66% - 75%	25	23	21	1	70
76% - 85%	13	15	9	--	37
86% - 95%	4	9	5	--	18
96% - 100%	2	8	8	--	18
No Response	16	30	21	--	67
Total	131	115	89	2	337
Average Percent	53%	51%	53%	65%	52%

(*) Percent figures in Tables 11, 12, 13, and 14 were grouped such that they may be easily compared from table to table. The group intervals are either identical, or where one table is more detailed than another, aggregation of the detail will produce figures directly comparable to those shown elsewhere at higher levels of summarization. Italicized entries in the row headings indicate the upper and lower bounds of comparable groupings.

for other wage and salary categories to reach an overall average salary percent that corresponds to the total line in Table 13. No other category of wage and salary expense was of the order of magnitude of professional salaries, but payments to clerical staff were of definite significance and accounted for an average of 12% of all IR funds expended. Payments to systems analysts, programmers, and so-called "other staff" accounted for the remainder of wage and salary expenditures.

TABLE 15

Average Percent of Total Expenditure for Institutional Research Devoted to Wages and Salaries by Type of Institution and Type of Employee

Type of Employee	Type of Institution			
	Universities	Four-Year Colleges	Two-Year Colleges	All Types
Professional Staff (1)	53%	51%	53%	52%
Systems Analysts	4%	1%	-- (2)	2%
Programmers	1%	1%	1%	1%
Clerical Staff	14%	11%	11%	12%
Other Staff	4%	3%	3%	4%
Subtotal	76%	67%	68%	71%
Non-Salary Expense (3)	24%	33%	32%	29%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

(1) Includes director.
(2) True value not zero, but too small to be recorded as a whole percent.
(3) See Table 17.

FULL TIME EQUIVALENT STAFF

Staffing figures, which are displayed in Table 16, parallel the distribution of salary figures by type of employee, although there are greater differences among the types of institutions. That is, all institutions in the sample seemed to devote their resources to wages and salaries to much the same extent, and the proportional distribution among types of employees was also quite similar. However, previous data have shown that universities spend, on the average, twice as much on IR as do either four or two-year colleges, and it is this that explains the total full time equivalent staff figure of 4.3 for universities compared to 1.7 and 2.1 for the other types of institutions, respectively.

It is also interesting to find the average two-year college with a staff figure higher than that for the average four-year college. The entire

TABLE 16

Average Number of Full Time Equivalent Institutional Research Staff by Type of Institution and Type of Employee

Type of Employee	Type of Institution			
	Univer-sities	Four-Year Colleges	Two-Year Colleges	All Types
Professional Staff[1]	2.2	.9	.9	1.4
Systems Analysts	.2	.0 (2)	.0 (2)	.1
Programmers	.1	.1	.1	.1
Clerical Staff	1.6	.5	.9	1.0
Other Staff	.2	.2	.2	.2
Total	4.3	1.7	2.1	2.8

(1) Includes director.

(2) True value not zero, but too small to be recorded with one decimal.

difference of 0.4 FTE occurs in clerical staff, which very likely bespeaks differences in the type of work these offices normally undertake. Also likely is that average salary levels at two-year colleges are slightly lower than at four-year colleges, enabling the former to employ more people on fewer dollars.

In any case, the typical IR office is not a large operation. It employs fewer than three full-time equivalent staff on a total budget of roughly $40,000. Seventy percent, or $28,000, goes toward wage and salary payments, leaving $12,000, or $1,000 per month, for telephone service, supplies, and all the other items necessary to keep the unit functioning. Moreover, a substantial proportion of the offices in the sample, perhaps as high as 45%, get along with fewer than 1.0 professional staff and a .5 FTE clerical staff presumably consisting of a secretary who is shared with some other office or department.

OTHER AREAS OF EXPENDITURE

In addition to the salary data discussed above, respondents were asked to indicate what percent of their total resources they spent in five other areas of expenditure. These were computer time, other electronic data processing expense, publication of reports or other documents, equipment and furniture, and an omnibus category called "Other Expense". Also, with regard to computer time, those IR offices which were not required to pay for time were asked to supply an estimate of the number of hours of subsidized time they used.

Internal checking of the salary responses indicated that they were consistent, logical, and could be manipulated arithmetically without distorting the result. This was not the case with the non-salary expense figures. A number of responses had to be discarded or were left blank, and those figures which were provided seemed to be consistently low. That is, the average institution accounted for less than 90% of its expenditures when all percent figures were summed. Apparently many respondents were less conscientious about the accuracy of their data toward the end of the questionnaire, especially in view of the fact that a substantial amount of accounting analysis would have been necessary in order to break the expenses into the categories shown.

There were several ways in which the data could have been adjusted to compensate for the condition just noted, but it was felt these would probably cause more distortion than they would remedy. Thus, the only adjustment that was made was to arbitrarily increase the category labelled "Other Expenses" such that each column in Table 17 would add to 100%. All other entries in Table 17 are true averages of data actually supplied on the questionnaires. Even without the adjustment, however, "Other Expenses" was equal to "Clerical Staff" as the second largest expense category.

TABLE 17

Average Percent of Total Expenditure for Institutional Research Devoted to Non-Salary Items by Type of Institution and Type of Expense

Type of Expense	Type of Institution			
	Univer-sities	Four-Year Colleges	Two-Year Colleges	All Types
Computer Time	2%	1%	-- (1)	1%
Other EDP Expense	1%	1%	-- (1)	1%
Publications	2%	2%	2%	2%
Equipment	2%	2%	2%	2%
Other Expenses (2)	17%	27%	28%	23%
Subtotal	24%	33%	32%	29%
Salary Expense	76%	67%	68%	71%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

(1) True value not zero, but too small to be recorded as a whole percent.

(2) Percents in this row were arbitrarily increased in order to balance each of the columns to 100%. Institutions typically accounted for less than 90% of their expenditures, so this adjustment was in some cases quite substantial. There is reason to believe that the salary data are complete and accurate, but the other figures were apparently based on rough estimates. It was felt that adjusting the so-called "Other Expense" category would least distort the relative balance among the categories shown. Figures actually supplied on the questionnaires would have read 14%, 10%, 10%, and 12% from left to right.

Only a few dozen respondents bothered to indicate in the spaces provided any detail on what comprised their so-called "Other Expenses". Most frequently mentioned were travel, telephone charges, postage, supplies, repairs, special studies, and memberships, in approximately that order of importance. Also mentioned were consultant fees, which for one institution amounted to 23% of the budget. It seems obvious now that the questionnaire should have provided a check list or other convenient means of eliciting more specific information on these expenditures. To have over 20% (see Table 17) of the total money expended fall into a completely unstructured category like "Other Expenses" hampers the analysis to an unfortunate degree. On the other hand, the categories which were provided represent very specialized areas of expense and are of greater intrinsic interest than a

detailed breakdown of the more or less routine business of keeping an office supplied with postage stamps, mimeograph paper and the like.

Table 17 provides data on three areas of expenditure which help to describe the way in which IR offices occupy a middle ground between traditional research and administrative units. It is somewhat surprising, for example, to find that "Computer Time" and "Other EDP Expense" represent a combined total of only 2% of IR budgets on the average. Even at universities with their larger enrollments and relatively larger IR offices, this figure was only 3%. But at the same time, the direct cost of producing publications was also 2% of the total expense. In a research-oriented field dealing with such things as enrollment statistics, survey results, and cost studies, one would expect to find more emphasis on computer usage. Yet it is also true that few purely administrative units produce formal publications to the extent of 2% of their overall budgets.

One reason for the seemingly minimal use of computer time is the existence of substantial amounts of subsidized time available to many IR offices. As noted above, data on the amount of such time were requested, and these data strongly suggest that subsidized time was the primary source of computing capacity for IR offices in general. The average institution in the sample used just under 20 hours of subsidized computer time, and even at a very conservative valuation of $50 per hour this is equivalent to an additional $1,000 of support and would increase the proportional expenditure for computer time from 1% to 3%. Moreover, if the true value of this time is greater than $50 per hour, as it probably is, the combined figure for all data processing including computer time might amount to as much as 5% or more of the total. This would be more in line with what a research unit might spend, but it is questionable whether research units would have as easy access to subsidized time as administrative units.

The rapid spread of IR offices which occurred during the decade of the 1960's was concurrent with the equally rapid spread of electronic computing equipment among institutions of higher education. Given this fact plus the quantitative nature of many IR problems, it was to be expected that IR offices would be regular users of such equipment. But Tables 15, 16, and 17 taken together show that IR offices are not, on the average, heavily involved with the design and maintenance of complex information systems.

Systems analysts and programmers, despite their relatively high pay rates, account for a combined total of only 3% of the IR budgets and in number comprise only 7% of the full-time equivalent staff. Even at universities, although 5% of IR budgets go to systems and programming personnel, these employees still represent the same 7% of total staff.

In sum, the distribution of expenditures for both salary and non-salary items shows that IR offices are oriented toward analysis and special projects rather than toward the routine production of basic data or the actual operation of administrative data processing facilities. Research and clerical salaries plus the cost of postage, telephone service, and supplies account for 87% of IR expenditures, and this, in a very broad sense, defines the role which IR has assumed on campuses in the United States and Canada.

SUMMARY

1. Of the institutions in the sample group, 23% had IR offices operating on their campuses as of the fall 1969 term.

2. The propensity of an institution to have an IR office was a direct function of its enrollment size, although public institutions were more likely to have such offices than private institutions.

3. The number of IR offices appears to have grown at a rate of roughly 15% per year in recent years.

4. If institutions which were actively planning to initiate IR offices during 1970-71 are combined with those served by state or other central IR agencies and this figure is added to the number of institutions which already have IR offices of their own, just under one-third (32%) of all institutions in the United States and Canada are currently served by an IR facility of some kind.

5. Average levels of financial support for IR offices varied widely with enrollment size. Overall, however, the average figure for institutions in the sample group was $42,150 per year.

6. The primary sources of financial support for IR offices were regularly budgeted institutional funds and grants or contracts with outside agencies. The former accounted for 90% of IR support funds.

7. For the sample group as a whole, 71% of the total expenditures went for wage and salary payments with roughly another 20% devoted to office supplies, travel, communications, and miscellaneous.

8. The average IR office had a staff of 2.8 full-time equivalent employees who fell primarily into the professional research and clerical categories.

9. A figure based on an estimated value for subsidized computer time combined with dollar amounts indicated for paid computer time and other data processing expense shows that the average IR office spent 3% - 5% of its resources on data processing and computing.

APPENDIX I

THE ASSOCIATION FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

October 12, 1970

To The President:

The Association for Institutional Research is a non-profit organization of academic and administrative professional members of institutions and agencies of higher education. Its purpose is to advance research leading to improved understanding, planning and operation of such institutions. Toward that end, the Association is currently conducting a survey to determine the level of financial support for the institutional research function at colleges and universities in the United States and Canada. Many institutions have recently initiated or are in the process of initiating offices of institutional research, and it is our hope that the results of this survey will be of benefit to them and to all others who are concerned with improving the educational process through research and planning.

If your institution has an office or bureau organized for institutional research or if there exists an ad hoc activity which performs this function, will you please arrange to have the attached questionnaire completed and returned in the envelope provided. If no such activity is recognized at your institution, we still ask that you provide answers to questions 1 and 2 and return the questionnaire to be included in our count.

It is our intention to publish a brief report based on the findings of the survey, although the anonymity of individual institutions will be carefully preserved. To insure this, all returns are routed directly to the public accounting firm of Touche Ross & Company in San Francisco where the envelopes will be opened and discarded and an initial tally of the results will be made. I would very much appreciate having your reply by November 30, 1970. Copies of the results can be obtained by writing to me at the address shown below. Thank you for your assistance.

Sidney Suslow
President

Office of Institutional Research
Room 210 Building T-8
University of California
Berkeley, Ca. 94720

APPENDIX I (continued)

SURVEY OF FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

Your responses to the following questions will enable the Association for Institutional Research to answer questions directed to it concerning the growth of institutional research as an organizational specialty in higher education. Where precise information is not available, estimates may be substituted, but we would appreciate your making an effort to answer all questions. Dollar amounts may be rounded to the nearest thousand and percents to the nearest whole number.

1. Institutional Profile

Please answer items A, B, and C below by marking the box near the entry which describes your institution.

A) Control of Institution

☐ Public ☐ Private

B) Type of Institution

☐ University ☐ Four-Year College ☐ Two-Year College

C) Average regular term enrollment during the 1969-70 year.

Full-Time Students	Part-Time Students
☐ Fewer than 1,000	☐ Fewer than 1,000
☐ 1,000 to 4,999	☐ 1,000 to 4,999
☐ 5,000 to 9,999	☐ 5,000 to 9,999
☐ 10,000 to 19,999	☐ 10,000 to 19,999
☐ 20,000 to 29,999	☐ 20,000 to 29,999
☐ 30,000 or more	☐ 30,000 or more

2. The Institutional Research Function

Does your institution have an office or unit whose primary responsibility is in the area of institutional research?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ A state or other central agency which has this function serves our needs.

If your answer to question 2 was other than Yes, your questionnaire is now complete. Please return it in the enclosed envelope.

3. Financial Support for Institutional Research in 1969-70

A) What was the total dollar amount allocated to institutional research from regular institutional funds at the beginning of the 1969-70 fiscal year? $_____

B) If additional allocations of regular institutional funds were made during the fiscal year, please indicate the total amount of such additional allocations. $_____

C) What was the total revenue earned by institutional research through recharges for services rendered to other organizational units in your institution? $_____

D) What was the total amount received from grants and/or contracts with outside agencies? $_____

E) What was the total amount received from sources other than those shown above? $_____

If this is a significant proportion of the total support, please specify these other sources:

_____

_____

Total Support (sum of items A-E above) $_____

4. Expenditures for Institutional Research Activity During 1969-70

What was the total dollar amount expended for institutional research at your institution? $_____*

*If your office is not required to pay directly for computing time put 0% in items 5Bi and 5Bii and include no computing costs in item #4.

5. Percent Distribution of Expenditures

Based on the total expenditure figure indicated in response to question 4, please show the percent expended in each of the following areas:

A. Salaries	% of Total IR Expend.	No. of FTE-IR Staff Positions
i) Professional Research Staff Including Director	_____	_____
ii) Systems Analysts	_____	_____
iii) Programmers and Equipment Operators	_____	_____
iv) Clerical and Clerical Supervision	_____	_____
v) Other_____ (please specify)	_____	_____

APPENDIX I (continued)

B) Electronic Data Processing*

*If your office is not required to pay directly for computing time put 0% in items 5Bi and 5Bii and include no computing costs in item #4.

	% of Total IR Expend.
i) Computer time	_____
ii) All other EDP expenditures	_____

(If office was not required to pay for computer time, please indicate the number of hours of computing used in 1969-70. _____)

C) Direct cost of producing publications: i.e., printing, binding, etc. _____

D) Equipment and furniture _____

E) All other expenses

If these represent a significant proportion of your total expenditures, please specify the important items:

_____

_____

Total Expenditures 100%

6. If possible, can you indicate the percent of your institution's overall operating expense (total expenditures exclusive of capital outlay) which the figure shown in item #4 represents.

_____

Thank you for your cooperation. Please return this questionnaire in the enclosed envelope to:

Association for Institutional Research
c/o Touche Ross & Co.
1 Maritime Plaza
San Francisco, Calif. 94111

APPENDIX II

Institutions Which Responded to the Survey by Type, Control, and Enrollment Size

Type & Control of Institution	Full Time Enrollment							
	Less than 1,000	1,000-4,999	5,000-9,999	10,000-19,999	20,000-29,999	30,000 And Above	Enroll. Not Indicated	Total
Universities								
I.R. Office Reported								
Publicly Controlled	--	18	34	30	8	6	2	98
Privately Controlled	1	12	10	8	--	--	1	32
Control Not Indicated	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	1
Total	1	30	45	38	8	6	3	131
No I.R. Office								
Publicly Controlled	12	20	18	9	--	1	3	63
Privately Controlled	11	31	15	3	--	--	1	61
Control Not Indicated	--	1	1	1	--	--	--	3
Total	23	52	34	13	--	1	4	127
All Universities								
Publicly Controlled	12	38	52	39	8	7	5	161
Privately Controlled	12	43	25	11	--	--	2	93
Control Not Indicated	--	1	2	1	--	--	--	4
Total	24	82	79	51	8	7	7	258
Four-Year Colleges								
I.R. Office Reported								
Publicly Controlled	4	27	16	3	--	--	--	50
Privately Controlled	30	34	--	--	--	--	--	64
Control Not Indicated	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	1
Total	34	62	16	3	--	--	--	115
No I.R. Office								
Publicly Controlled	11	51	7	--	--	--	--	69
Privately Controlled	283	120	--	--	--	--	7	410
Control Not Indicated	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
Total	295	171	7	--	--	--	7	480
All Four-Year Colleges								
Publicly Controlled	15	78	23	3	--	--	--	119
Privately Controlled	313	154	--	--	--	--	7	474
Control Not Indicated	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	2
Total	329	233	23	3	--	--	7	595

APPENDIX II (Continued)

Institutions Which Responded to the Survey by Type, Control, and Enrollment Size

Type & Control of Institution	Full Time Enrollment							
	Less Than 1,000	1,000-4,999	5,000-9,999	10,000-19,999	20,000-29,999	30,000-And Above	Enroll. Not Indicated	Total
Two-Year Colleges								
I.R. Office Reported								
Publicly Controlled	10	48	17	4	1	--	3	83
Privately Controlled	2	3	--	--	--	--	--	5
Control Not Indicated	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	1
Total	12	52	17	4	1	--	3	89
No I.R. Office								
Publicly Controlled	214	128	15	1	--	--	3	361
Privately Controlled	81	7	--	--	--	--	2	90
Control Not Indicated	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	1
Total	295	136	15	1	--	--	5	452
All Two-Year Colleges								
Publicly Controlled	224	176	32	5	1	--	6	244
Privately Controlled	83	10	--	--	--	--	2	95
Control Not Indicated	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	2
Total	307	188	32	5	1	--	8	541
Total Sample Group								
I.R. Office Reported								
Publicly Controlled	15	93	68	37	9	6	5	233
Privately Controlled	33	49	10	8	--	--	1	101
Control Not Indicated	--	2	1	--	--	--	--	3
Total	48	144	79	45	9	6	6	337
No I.R. Office								
Publicly Controlled	252	202	40	10	--	1	6	511
Privately Controlled	402	159	15	3	--	--	11	590
Control Not Indicated	2	2	1	1	--	--	--	6
Total	656	363	56	14	--	1	17	1107
All Institutions								
Publicly Controlled	267	295	108	47	9	7	11	744
Privately Controlled	435	208	25	11	--	--	12	691
Control Not Indicated	2	4	2	1	--	--	--	9
Total	704	507	135	59	9	7	23	1444